

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_77049
Title of the Manuscript:	Biodegradation Capacity and Activity Enzymatic of Bacillus subtilis Against Low-Density Polyethylene
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction describes plastics, the related issues, different methods of degradation, the author(s) should highlight the importance of the current research • Line 113-115 - This was determined by the method of Lowry <i>et al.</i> (1951) – short description of the method principle is necessary • Line 117-120 – too vague, more detail necessary • The conclusion should define the merits of the experiment as opposed to just reiterating data. • Line 163-181 – the results were stated, then it was indicated that “results that coincide with that reported for three strains of the fungus <i>A. niger</i> isolated from plastic from the waste dump” – Since the results agree with previous research, what do these results add to it? (When pointing out correlations or lack of it, it helps to include why you think this is so) • Line 171 “But these results are slightly higher than the reported “ and Line 175 “the data found are lower than that reported for the biodegradation” - discuss why this might be • Line 266-267 - but more studies are required to determine which activities are the most efficient in the degradation of this substrate, as well as to optimize the production of the same for a faster and more efficient biodegradation – can be placed in the conclusion 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 42 - Among the physicists are photo-degradation and thermodegradation – “physicists” needs to change • Line 95-96 - All experiments were performed at least 3 times in duplicate – These results can be tabulated for a better representation • More discussions on the meaning of the experimental findings – Does the experiment provides a new insight or does it contributes a clearer understanding 	
Optional/General comments	<p>Aims: The objective of this work was to determine the degradation capacity of low-density polyethylene by the bacterium <i>Bacillus subtilis</i>, and analyze the production of extracellular laccase activity.</p> <p>Discuss the importance of the objective of this study – Highlights the importance of your study, how it can contribute to understanding the research problem within the field of study, how the findings from your study reveal and help fill gaps in the literature that had not been previously exposed or adequately described</p> <p>Based on the discussion of your results, you can make recommendations in the conclusion.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Karuna K. Arjoon
Department, University & Country	Trinidad and Tobago